



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

10/08/2004

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/040,518	03/17/1998	COSTAS N. KARATZAS	06632/011001	1912
20583	7590	10/08/2004	EXAMINER	
JONES DAY 222 EAST 41ST ST NEW YORK, NY 10017				FALK, ANNE MARIE
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		1632		

DATE MAILED: 10/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/040,518	KARATZAS ET AL.
	Examiner Anne-Marie Falk, Ph.D.	Art Unit 1632

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Anne-Marie Falk, Ph.D. (3) Roger Rich.

(2) Nikolaos George. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 04 October 2004.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 22-36 and 39-58.

Identification of prior art discussed: None.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Anne-Marie Falk
ANNE-MARIE FALK, PH.D
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Art Unit: 1632

The Attorney contacted the Examiner for clarification of several issues relating to the written description rejection as it relates to Claim 39. The Attorney was confused about the written description rejection on page 4 of the Office Action mailed May 3, 2004 where the Examiner points out that the claims cover a female ruminant produced by *in vivo* somatic cell gene transfer, but the specification does not describe or contemplate *in vivo* somatic cell gene transfer. The Attorney apparently was under the impression that “*in vivo* somatic cell gene transfer” refers to nuclear transfer. However, the Examiner pointed out and clarified that “*in vivo* somatic cell gene transfer” refers to gene transfer **to** somatic cells of an animal, whereas “nuclear transfer” involves the transfer of an entire genome (i.e., the nucleus of a cell), sometimes **from** a somatic cell, **to** an enucleated egg. As an example, the Examiner pointed out that the claim, as written, would cover animals produced by introducing a gene delivery vector into the mammary tissue of an adult animal. In such a case, the gene would be transferred only to somatic cells and not to germ cells of the animal. The specification does not describe *in vivo* somatic cell gene transfer to produce the claimed animals, but rather only describes using pronuclear microinjection to make transgenic animals which are genetically modified in both the germ cells and somatic cells. The Attorney stated that they will consider amending the claims to refer to a transgenic ruminant comprising a transgene in the genome of both germline cells and somatic cells.

The Attorney further referred to the discussion on page 5 of the same Office Action regarding mosaic animals vs. chimeric animals. The Attorney stated that, in the Examples section, they mention chimeric animals where they should have referred to mosaic animals. The Examiner looked at Example 8 and stated that, although the reference to chimeric animals appears to be wrong or confused, it is not apparent that Applicants intended to refer to mosaic animals instead. The Attorney then suggested that the amendments they are considering to recite a transgenic ruminant comprising a transgene in the genome of both germline cells and somatic cells would probably render the issue moot. The Examiner

Art Unit: 1632

further pointed out that the claims should not cover mosaic animals because there is not a written description of mosaic ruminants.

With regard to the enablement issues, the Attorney stated that they intended to submit a Declaration describing the production of at least 100 animals, produced following the teachings of the specification, where multi-gram quantities of biofilament protein is obtained, and where more than one regulatory sequence is tested in the animals.

With regard to the written description rejection on the nucleic acids, the Attorney stated that they are still considering how to amend the claims to an appropriate scope to overcome this rejection.